

TTF CG Meeting Minutes November 6, 2002

To: Distribution

From: Bob Hunnicutt, Tower Coordinator, Columbia Telecommunications

A meeting of the Telecommunications Transmission Facility Coordinating Group (TTF CG) was held on November 6, 2002. The following people were in attendance:

MEMBERS

Jane Lawton OCA (240) 777-3724

Bill Landfair M-NCPPC (301) 495-4588

Pat Hanehan MCPS (301) 279-3609

Helen Xu DTS (240) 777-2804

Melanie Coffin OMB (240) 777-2763

STAFF

Margie Williams OCA (240) 777-3762

Robert Hunnicutt CTC (410) 964-5700

Kamal Johari CTC (410) 964-5700

OTHER ATTENDEES

Steve Weber VoiceStream Wireless

Janet Brown Jackson & Campbell

Jim Michal Jackson & Campbell

M.G. Diamond for Verizon Wireless

Henri Edoh Sprint PCS

Robin Bryan Darnestown Civic Association

Stephen Ellis Darnestown Civic Association

Kathy Reilly M-NCPPC

Discussion Item - Approval of October 9, 2002 minutes: It was noted that the minutes had previously been approved as submitted via electronic proxy.

Jane Lawton asked if copies of the minutes were available. Bob Hunnicutt responded that they were posted on the County's website. Margie Williams added that the website was undergoing changes and although the database was not current, the minutes were up-to-date.

Action Item: Sprint PCS application to construct a new 105' monopole on the Petrucelli property located at 14120 Darnestown Road in Germantown (Application #200210-01).

Bob Hunnicutt noted that this application was for a siting in the Darnestown area, in the vicinity where three facilities had previously been proposed by Verizon, but were rejected by Darnestown residents, and siting in this area was quite controversial.

Kamal Johari summarized the application, noting there were no existing facilities for co-location except a church bell tower. He added that the bell tower would have been a likely co-location option, but the TTF CG had already recommended Nextel's antennas to be located there, though Nextel had postponed use of that site for the present time.

Jane Lawton asked if Sprint representatives had spoken with church officials regarding potential attachment to that facility, and also asked if that facility could accommodate two sets of antennas. Henri Edoh, Sprint's engineer, stated Sprint had considered use of the bell tower, which is approximately 58' tall, but that site would be too low to meet its coverage objectives.

Bob Hunnicutt said that when Nextel's application was reviewed, Darnestown Civic Association representatives had discussed the potential for additional attachments to the church. He recalled that the bell tower was a square brick structure with four brick columns supporting a pyramid-shaped roof. He stated that the current

design of the bell tower does not appear to be capable of supporting a second set of antennas without major structural changes to increase the space on the brick support columns, which he did not believe the church would be eager to pursue.

Mr. Edoh added that Sprint had spoken with church officials about adding a second set of stealth-designed antennas on the church property; however, the church was not interested in pursuing this option. Robin Bryan, the Darnestown Civic Association representative, stated that his organization had also spoken with church officials regarding a second siting on church property, and agreed that the church was not willing to allow additional antennas.

Mr. Johari stated that in reviewing the application, the Tower Coordinator considered use of the PEPCO transmission line facilities to the east, but concluded attachment in that location would not provide coverage as far west as Sprint desired to provide service and would be too close to existing Sprint antennas at Fire Station #31 at Darnestown Road and Quince Orchard Road. PEPCO transmission line facilities to the north were also considered, but that location would not provide coverage as far south as Sprint desired to provide service. Helen Xu asked how far the proposed site was from the PEPCO transmission line towers. Mr. Hunnicutt replied it was approximately 1.7 miles west of the PEPCO facilities.

Mr. Johari concluded by saying that based on the information presented, including the review of the RF propagation maps, it appears that there is a need for coverage in this area, and these antennas as proposed would provide the desired coverage.

Jane Lawton asked if the equipment shelter would be fairly well concealed. Mr. Hunnicutt stated that the equipment shelter appeared to be situated behind the house concealing the shelter area from the roadway. The rear of the property was concealed by trees, as was the west side. The east side of the property has a large open grassy area but abuts a commercial parking lot behind offices on Seneca Road at Route 28.

Helen Xu asked about the size of the cell coverage radius. Mr. Edoh replied that coverage would be provided to an area of approximately 1.5 miles wide. Ms. Xu asked if Sprint planned to place other towers along Route 28. Mr. Edoh replied that Sprint already had antennas to the east at Fire Station #31, and to the west at the Troop 52 site.

Robin Bryan added that he wanted to make sure that this facility worked with the current and proposed aesthetics for the Darnestown area. He stated that future plans called for a large traffic circle and some other improvements at the intersection of Seneca Road and Route 28, and wanted to make sure the facility would fit in with those design plans. He added that they did not want the flagpole to be lighted, and would prefer to see some sort of automatic device for stowing flag which would satisfy their concerns about proper raising, lowering, and display of the American flag. He submitted procedures for proper public display of a flag.

Jim Michal stated there was no plan to light the pole, but if they did, it would be a 150 watt light positioned on the ground to shine on the flag, which he believed would not be objectionable to those able to see it. He stated that in other jurisdictions, they had provided lighting for a flag and it was well received in the community. He stated that the Darnestown Community may want to light the flag for a trial period of 30-60 days, and if there were any complaints, they could turn it off.

Jane Lawton stated that care of the flag was really an issue for the Board of Appeals to discuss, but asked if it was not lit, who was responsible for raising and lowering the flag. Mr. Michal stated that provisions for stowing the flag could be made at the base of the monopole. Robin Bryan stated that he would encourage Sprint to make the flag self-maintaining, raising/lowering, and stowing. Jane Lawton encouraged the industry to consider those options to make these flag-style stealth sitings more capable of addressing these issues.

Mr. Bryan noted he wanted to make it clear that the community was interested in having only one facility if there was to be one at all, and they had hoped this would be the only facility in the Darnestown area. Ms. Lawton stated that she appreciated the community's concern, but she could not guarantee that would be the case and that there would not be any future applications for service to that area. Bob Hunnicutt added that although this facility is capable of accommodating additional antennas, it may not be as desirable for some carrier's network design because of the limitations on the antenna configuration necessary to attach to this "flagpole" type structure.

Darnestown representative Stephen Ellis stated that an Armenian church was proposed for construction in the area, and it was designed with a tall steeple which, perhaps, could also accommodate future carrier antennas. Ms. Lawton encouraged Mr. Ellis to advise those who are constructing the church of that possibility, so the steeple could be designed to accommodate antennas.

Helen Xu asked the location of the roads bounding the service area mentioned in the Tower Coordinator's recommendation, as they did not appear to be on the map. Mr. Hunnicutt, using a site map showing a greater area of Darnestown than the map provided in the application, reviewed the location of the perimeters of the cell service area.

Mr. Bryan stated he wished to thank Sprint for working so closely with the community, as they found it very helpful in resolving any concerns they had with the siting.

Motion: Pat Hanehan moved the application be recommended. Bill Landfair seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

Action Item: Sprint PCS application to construct a new 100' monopole on the Grace Fellowship Church property located at 8425 Damascus Road in Damascus (Application #200210-02)

Kamal Johari summarized the application, noting that the only nearby existing structure was a silo. He noted, however, that given its elevation and distance to the west, he did not believe the coverage would be comparable to that proposed by the church location, and could possibly even widen some areas of where it appeared there would be poor service to the east even with the site as proposed. He noted that the Tower Coordinator considered use of the PEPCO transmission line towers to the east, but believed attachment to those facilities would not provide coverage as far west as currently proposed site. Bob Hunnicutt added that one of the PEPCO transmission line towers was an alternate site used by AT&T Wireless in lieu of constructing a monopole at the Stanley property.

Jane Lawton asked Mr. Hunnicutt to describe the path of the transmission lines. Mr. Hunnicutt traced the PEPCO lines path using the map included with the Sprint application.

Mr. Johari noted that the monopole would accommodate two additional carriers using the same antenna configuration, and it would be visible from the homes in the general area of the monopole as well as from the roadways approaching the site.

Jane Lawton commended Sprint on the use of a stealth design for these sitings, and for working so well with the community. Jim Michal noted that the flagpole design of the monopole does not work well for all carriers, but did provide some option for co-location.

Bill Landfair asked how the cables from the equipment area would connect to the monopole. Bob Hunnicutt explained that the monopole and shelter were behind the church, separated by an asphalt driveway. The cables would run under the driveway from the shelter on the hilltop to the monopole next to the church. Mr. Edoh agreed, but noted that the shelter would be built into the hillside, not on top of it.

Motion: Bill Landfair moved the application be recommended. Pat Hanehan seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

Discussion Item - Legislative/Fee Update: Jane Lawton noted that the zoning text amendments have been approved, and hoped they would be helpful in furthering the interests of the carriers as well as the community for future tower sitings.

In regard to the application fees, she stated that the Executive Regulation was still being prepared and she was not able to discuss the proposed fees at this time. She noted that the carriers had met with the County Executive as well as the County Council, and additional revisions had been made to the fee structure to try to address their concerns. She said she hoped that the carriers would find the revisions acceptable understanding the intent of the legislation.

Pat Hanehan asked if he could be sent copies of the final zoning text amendment. Margie Williams stated she did not have signed copies yet. Melanie Coffin added that copies of the legislation were available on the

County Council website by date the resolution was adopted, which she believed was last Tuesday.

Discussion Item - TTF CG Meeting Schedule Update: Pat Hanehan asked why the meeting time had been changed from 2:00 p.m. to 10:00 a.m. Bob Hunnicutt explained that Tracey Williams, the WSSC representative, had difficulty making the late afternoon meetings, and the change was to try to accommodate her schedule. Jane Lawton noted that other members previously had conflicts with morning meetings. Mr. Hunnicutt stated that Eric Carzon of the Budget Office had standing staff meetings on Wednesday mornings. Melanie Coffin stated that she still had the same conflict; and consequently, there may be some meetings she will not be able to attend. It was agreed that the group would try the 10:00 a.m. meeting times, and if it proved to be a problem for anyone, they could reconsider the meeting time.